

REMARKS

Applicant's attorney thanks the Examiner for discussing the application in the telephone interview of December 3, 2008. In the interview, Applicant's attorney and the Examiner discussed the claimed feature of translating a first web service description language (WSDL) file describing synchronous operations for a web service into a second WSDL file describing asynchronous operations. The claims have been amended to more clearly define this feature. The Examiner indicated in the interview that further consideration and search may be needed following this Amendment, but that the Examiner would telephone Applicant's attorney if there were any further issues to discuss to put the application into condition for allowance.

Claims 1-20, 22-41, and 43-54 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 34, and 36 are amended, as set forth above. The claim amendments are supported by the specification, for example, in paragraphs [0043] and [0044]. No new matter has been added.

Objection to Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a)

The amendment filed May 6, 2008 was objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a) as introducing new matter into the disclosure. Claims 1, 13, 34, and 36 have been amended as set forth above to clarify the features at issue. Applicant has ensured that the current claim language is supported by the specification, for example in paragraphs [0043] and [0044]. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objection under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a) be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 13, 34, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Claims 1, 13, 34, and 36 have been amended to clarify the features at issue, as explained above. It is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-20, 23-24, 26, and 36-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Niblett et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,336,135) (hereinafter "Niblett") and Han et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0143819 A1) (hereinafter "Han"). Claims 13, 22, 27-35, and 43-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Niblett, Han, and Blair et al. (U.S. Pat.

No. 6,065,082) (hereinafter “Blair”). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Niblett and Bowman et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,438,594) (hereinafter “Bowman”).

These rejections and the associated assertions in the Office Action are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The independent claims have been amended to clarify features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Niblett, Han, Blair, and Bowman, considered alone or in combination. By way of illustration, claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method for selectively accessing one or more web services from a client machine. The method comprises:

providing a first web service description language file describing synchronous operations for a web service, the first web service description language file describing how to connect to or communicate with the web service using synchronous communications;

translating the first web service description language file into a second web service description language file describing asynchronous operations, the second web service description language file describing how to connect to or communicate with the web service using asynchronous communications;

receiving a request to use asynchronous communications for communications between the client machine and at least one web service;

providing the second web service description language file to the client machine for generation of client machine code to interact with the at least one web service;

(Emphasis added).

As discussed in the telephone interview, embodiments of claim 1 may provide certain benefits as described in the specification:

[0043] Many synchronous web services use WSDL to describe the web service. When a synchronous requestor would like to synchronously invoke a synchronous web service, the requestor can obtain the WSDL file describing the synchronous web service, bring the WSDL file into their computer system, which parses the WSDL file and generates code on the requestor’s computer system that can properly invoke the synchronous web service. **However, as was seen in FIG. 3, many requestors communicate asynchronously and can therefore not benefit from the WSDL files that are designed for synchronous communication.**

[0044] The invention solves this problem by translating a WSDL file published by a synchronous web service (110)

with the integration services network (106) into a WSDL file that can be used by an asynchronous requestor.

(Emphasis added).

As discussed in the telephone interview, certain passages of Niblett cited in the Office Action (Page 4, lines 5-8) discuss some aspects of synchronous and asynchronous communication. (Col. 6, l. 24-30). However, there is no mention anywhere in Niblett of a web service description language (“WSDL”) file describing how to connect to or communicate with a web service using synchronous communications. (Col. 6, l. 24-30). Further, nowhere in Niblett is there any disclosure or suggestion of translating a first WSDL file into a second WSDL file describing how to connect to or communicate with a web service using asynchronous communications. (Col. 6, l. 24-30).

Other sections of Niblett, such as for example the discussion of converting an HTML request to a different format (Col. 8, l. 12-37), also fail to disclose or suggest the above-quoted features recited in claim 1. First, the HTML request described in Niblett refers to the format of the message itself, not a WSDL file or any other type of file describing synchronous communications. For example, the HTML request in Niblett is a message “*within a synchronous communication session*” (Col. 8, l. 20-21) (Emphasis added), not a file *describing how to connect to or communicate with a web service using synchronous communications*, as recited in claim 1. Second, the discussion in Niblett related to “convert[ing] the received HTML request into a message format recognisable to the application program” (Col. 8, l. 12-37) includes no disclosure or suggestion that the result of this conversion is a second file that *describes how to connect to or communicate with a web service using asynchronous communications*. For example, Niblett teaches that the HTML request is transformed “If the application program cannot interpret HTML” (Col. 8, l. 26), but there is no disclosure or suggestion that the transformed HTML request describes asynchronous communications. Thus, as discussed in the telephone interview, Niblett does not disclose or suggest all of the above-quoted features of claim 1.

The Office Action cites Han as disclosing a web service description language file. (Office Action, page 4). However, as discussed in the telephone interview, Han only describes certain characteristics of a WSDL file (§ [0161]), not the translation of a first WSDL file describing synchronous operations for a web service into a second WSDL file describing asynchronous operations. For example, there is no disclosure or suggestion in paragraph [0161] of translating a

WSDL file, or of a first WSDL file describing synchronous communications, or of a second WSDL file describing asynchronous communications.

Other sections of Han, such as the discussion of an XML representation in paragraph [0179], also fail to disclose or suggest the above-quoted features of claim 1. The XML representation described in Han is a message related to content delivery rather than a WSDL file describing how to connect to or communicate with a web service using synchronous communications. Further, the discussion in Han related to an XML representation transformed into a markup language specific to the describer (§ [0179]) includes no disclosure or suggestion that the XML representation is translated into a WSDL file. Finally, there is disclosure or suggestion in Han that the transformed XML representation describes how to connect to or communicate with a web service using asynchronous communications. There is no disclosure or suggestion that, for example, the markup language discussed in Han describes how to connect to or communicate with the web service, or that the transformation relates to translating a first file describing synchronous communications into a second file describing asynchronous communications. Thus, as discussed in the telephone interview, Han fails to disclose or suggest all of the above-quoted features of claim 1.

Thus, the same above-quoted features recited in claim 1 are lacking in Niblett and Han, considered alone or in combination. Blair and Bowman are not cited in the Office Action as disclosing or suggesting any of the features discussed above. Since one or more of the above-quoted features of claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, considered alone or in combination, claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Independent claims 13, 34, and 36 have been amended to include features similar to those of claim 1. The dependent claims include all the features of the independent claims on which they are based. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-20, 22-41, and 43-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the pending claims are allowable for the reasons above and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below if the Examiner has any remaining questions or concerns regarding the prosecution of this application.

Applicant hereby petitions for any additional extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 504480 (Order No. ODVFP007).

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/John F. Griffith/

John F. Griffith
Reg. No. 44,137

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100